

ROEZL AND THE TYPE OF WASHINGTONIA

The palms on which WENDLAND founded his genus *Washingtonia* were grown from seed procured by ROEZL. They purported to have come from "Nord Mexico, bei Arizona, am Rio Colorado," but where they really came from has never been ascertained. In investigating the history of the genus it proved very difficult to obtain any account of ROEZL's American explorations. I was able to learn only of a journey made by him across the northern continent in 1872, and was therefore led to assert³ that this was his only visit to our country. In fact, however, he had made a far more extended tour in 1868-1870, in the course of which he explored much of the United States and Mexico, and of Columbia in the southern continent. Some account of these journeyings is given in notes published by ORTGIES in volumes 20 and 23 of *Gartenflora*. Dr. TRELEASE, director of the Missouri Botanical Garden, has obligingly furnished me with an abstract of these notes, and from them I am able to present the following account of ROEZL's explorations in the United States.

ROEZL must have gone from Europe directly to Mexico, and he spent the winter of 1868-1869 in collecting in that state and in Yucatan. In March of the latter year he sailed from Havana for New York. He then visited several of the seaboard cities and made some collections in the Allegheny mountains, after which he departed for the west by way of St. Louis, Chicago, and Omaha. On July 15, 1869, he was in Cheyenne, and on August 28 in Truckee. Considerable time was devoted to collecting in Utah and Nevada, but by November 7 he had reached San Francisco, by way of Sacramento. After a run back to Nevada City he returned to San Francisco, and went thence to San Diego. The object of his southern trip was to gather *Delphinium cardinale*, and he sent to Europe two thousand roots that he supposed to be of that species. Eventually, on flowering they proved to be one of the blue larkspurs, probably *D. Parryi*. Here also he got two plants which were introduced to European cultivation as *Yucca schidigera* and *Y. Ortgiesiana*, unquestionably the species now known as *Yucca mohavensis* and *Hesperoyucca Whipplei*.

ROEZL returned to San Francisco in time to sail on January 18, 1870, for Panama, and after making extensive collections in Columbia and Mexico, again reached San Francisco August 1, 1870.

After a week spent in Hoopa Valley, he sailed for the north, visiting

³ BOT. GAZETTE 44:414. 1907. Footnote 10 on this page should be corrected as follows: *dele* 1839:330; for Jour. Bot. 1874: read 1834:; for Gard. Chron. 2:521. 1889 read Gard. Chron. N. S. 24:521. 1888.

Astoria, Portland, and Ft. Vancouver. In September he was among the mountains of the upper Columbia River, but by October he had returned to the Sierra Nevada of California. It does not appear when he finally left California, but by the middle of December 1870 he was again in Panama. The first two months of the new year were devoted to revisiting Columbia, after which ROEHL returned to Europe.

It appears from this account that the only opportunity which ROEHL had of procuring seeds of *Washingtonia* was during his visit to San Diego, in December 1869. The notes, however, contain no reference to this palm. But a visit to any of its desert habitats would certainly have been an experience too notable to have failed of record. Nor is it probable that his visit to San Diego, so short and so diligently occupied in collecting, could have afforded time for the difficult journey to the desert. The vague and confused habitat assigned to the palm is itself a sufficient evidence that the collector, from whom the information must have come, could never have visited a native grove. It is safe to conclude that the seed he sent to Europe came from some of the older cultivated trees at San Diego, and that his pardonable ignorance of local geography prevented him from correctly understanding what was told him of the location of the indigenous groves.
—S. B. PARISH, *San Bernardino, Cal.*

LONGEVITY OF SEEDS

In the *BOTANICAL GAZETTE* for January 1909, p. 69, CROCKER, in referring to my paper on this subject, concludes with the remark: "I believe I am doing the author no injustice when I say that it is impossible to tell from his paper in how far it is a contribution and in how far a compilation." May I say that the utmost care was taken to quote the authority for every record or fact that was not original, and that I am unable to find a single case in which this was not done. If any such omission occurs it is a purely accidental one, and I am prepared to offer both a public and a private apology to any author whose name is omitted as the authority for a record for which he is responsible. Naturally, however, if on repeating a test or experiment a more or less divergent result is obtained, the original authority can hardly be given for the changed statement of fact, which in many cases directly negatives the original record. The latter, however, is given in all cases with the author's name appended, so that it is difficult to see any foundation for CROCKER's criticism.—ALFRED J. EWART, *University of Melbourne.*